

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Favorable reconsideration of this application as presently amended and in light of the following discussion is respectfully requested.

Claims 6-11 are pending in the present application, Claims 6-11 having been amended. Support for the amendment to Claims 6 and 10 is found, for example, in Figs. 5A-5C and their corresponding description in the specification. Claims 7-9 and 11 are amended to be consistent with Claims 6 and 10. Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter is added.

In the outstanding Office Action, Claims 6, 7, and 9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(c) as unpatentable over Tanba (JP 2003-068862) in view of Pon (U.S. Patent No. 6,800,918); Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tanba in view of Kawahisa et al. (U.S. Patent No. 2003-068862, hereinafter Kawahisa); and Claims 10 and 11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over Tanba in view of Fattaruso (U.S. Patent No. 6,348,391).

Applicants thank the Examiner for the courtesy of an interview extended to Applicants' representative on May 16, 2007. During the interview, differences between the present invention and the applied art, and the rejections noted in the outstanding Office Action were discussed. No agreement was reached pending the Examiner's further review when a response is filed.

With respect to the rejection of Claim 6 as unpatentable over Tanba and Pon, Applicants respectfully submit that the amendment to Claim 6 overcomes this ground of rejection. Amended Claim 6 recites, *inter alia*,

a first shield structure provided with a second conductor interconnection in a ring having a continuous configuration provided along an outer periphery of the spiral pattern of the inductor except for an opening in a portion of the second conductor interconnection, and the second conductor is electrically connected to ground potential;

a second shield structure disposed at a layer below the first shield structure such that the first shield structure and second shield structure are in different vertical planes, the first shield structure and the second shield structure each having a perimeter that is partially opened;

the first and second shield structures are arranged such that the openings in the perimeters of the first and second shield structures are not superposed in a stacked state; and

a third shield structure disposed at a layer below the second shield structure, a perimeter of the third shield structure including an opening at a position where the perimeter of the first shield structure is open, an opening at a position where the perimeter of the second shield structure is open, and an opening at another position.

As discussed during the interview, Applicants' Figs. 5A-5C show the three different shield structures of the semiconductor device of Applicants' Fig. 3. Each of the shield structures shown in Figs. 5A-5C is located in a different plane of the semiconductor device of Applicants' Fig. 3. The opening in the first shield structure does not overlap with the opening in the second shield structure, and the third shield structure includes an opening at a position where the perimeter of the first shield structure is open, an opening at a position where the perimeter of the second shield structure is open, and an opening at another position.

While no agreement on patentability was reached during the above-noted interview, these differences were pointed out as structural differences from the devices shown in Tanba and Pon. Accordingly, the present amendment presents these features for the Examiner's formal consideration. Applicants respectfully submit that Tanba and Pon, taken alone or in proper combination, do not disclose or suggest the above-noted features of amended Claim 6.

Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that Kawahisa and Fattaruso do not cure the above-noted deficiencies of Tanba and Pon.

Furthermore, Claim 10 has been amended to recite first-third shield structures which are not disclosed or suggested by the above-noted references. Moreover, Applicants

respectfully submit that the pending dependent claims are allowable because of their dependency on the allowable independent claims.

Consequently, in light of the above discussion and in view of the present amendment, the present application is believed to be in condition for allowance and an early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Eckhard H. Kuesters
Attorney of Record
Registration No. 28,870

Customer Number
22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000
Fax: (703) 413 -2220
(OSMMN 06/04)

Joseph Wrkich
Registration No. 53,796